arXiv:1210.2155v1 [quant-ph] 8 Oct 2012

LINEAR MAPS PRESERVING SEPARABILITY OF PURE STATES

JINCHUAN HOU AND XIAOFEI QI

Abstract. Linear maps preserving pure states of a quantum system of any dimension are characterized. This is then used to characterize linear maps that preserve separable pure states in multipartite systems.

1. Introduction

A quantum state is a density operator acting on a complex Hilbert space which is positive and has trace 1. Denote by $\mathcal{S}(H)$ the set of all states on a Hilbert space H. In quantum information theory we deal, in general, with multipartite systems. The underlying space H of a multipartite composite quantum system is a tensor product of underlying spaces H_i of its subsystems, that is, $H = H_1 \otimes H_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes H_n$. In the case $n = 2$ the system is called a bipartite system. If H and K are finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H \otimes K)$ is said to be separable if ρ can be written as

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i \rho_i \otimes \sigma_i, \tag{0.1}$$

where ρ_i and σ_i are states on H and K respectively, and p_i are positive numbers with $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = 1$. Otherwise, ρ is said to be inseparable or entangled (ref. [1, 6]). For the case that at least one of H and K is of infinite dimension, by Werner [7], a state ρ acting on $H \otimes K$ is called separable if it can be approximated in the trace norm by the states of the form (0.1). Otherwise, ρ is called an entangled state. The (full) separability of multipartite states can be defined similarly.

Entanglement is a basic physical resource to realize various quantum information and quantum communication tasks [3, 4, 6]. So it is important to determine whether or not a state in a composite system is separable, which is also a very difficult task in this field. Thus, this makes it interesting to find linear maps sending states to states which will simplify a given state so that it is easier to detect the entanglement in it. Such linear maps used clearly

---

PACS. 03.67.Bg, 03.65.Db, 02.30.Tb.

Key words and phrases. Quantum states, separability, pure states, linear maps, affine maps.

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11171249, 11101250), Youth Foundation of Shanxi Province (2012021004) and Young Talents Plan for Shanxi University.

should be leave the separability of states invariant. This proposes the question of studying linear preservers of separable states. This question was attacked in [2] for finite dimensional systems. Let $\mathbf{H}_N$ be the real linear space of all $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices. It was shown in [2] that, if a linear map $\Phi : \mathbf{H}_{n_1n_2} \to \mathbf{H}_{n_1n_2}$ preserves separable pure states in both directions in bipartite system $\mathbb{C}^{n_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$, then Φ sends product states to product states, that is, $\Phi(A_1 \otimes A_2) = \psi_1(A_{p_1}) \otimes \psi_2(A_{p_2})$, where (p_1, p_2) is a permutation of $(1, 2)$, $n_j = n_{p_j}$ and $\psi_j : M_{n_j} \to M_{n_j}$ is a linear map of the form $X \mapsto U_jXU_j^*$ or $X \mapsto U_jX^tU_j^*$ for a unitary matrix $U_j \in M_{n_j}$. A similar result holds for finite dimensional multipartite systems. It is then natural and interesting to ask what is the corresponding result for infinite dimensional case? The purpose of the present paper is to study the question for infinite dimensional systems.

Let $\mathcal{T}(H)$ be the Banach space of trace-class operators on H endowed with the trace-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\rm Tr}$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ the subspace of self-adjoint operators and finite-rank self-adjoint operators of $\mathcal{T}(H)$, respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{P}ur(H)$ the set of pure states on H. We first consider in Section 2 the question of characterizing linear maps preserving pure states since which is basic for the study of our main question. It is shown that a linear map $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$ satisfies $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if Φ either has the form $A \mapsto {\rm Tr}(A)R$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$; or has the form $A \mapsto UAU^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$; or has the form $A \mapsto UA^tU^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$, where $R \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and $U \in \mathcal{B}(H, K)$ with $U^*U = I_H$, that is, U is an isometry. If, in addition, Φ also preserves the states, then Φ has one of the above forms for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$. Particularly, if Φ preserves pure states in both directions, then Φ has one of the last two forms with U unitary. The main result of this section generalizes a result in [2] for finite dimensional case.

In Section 3 we discuss the question of characterizing linear maps preserving separable pure states of bipartite systems. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ stand for the convex set of all separable states on $H \otimes K$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ the linear manifolds generated by $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ and finite-rank elements in $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$, respectively. Our main result gives a characterization of linear maps from $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes K)$ into itself which preserve separable pure states (no necessarily in both directions). It turns out such maps have one of nine forms on $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ (see Theorem 3.2). However, for most situations they have a form ((6) or (7) in Theorem 3.2). As an application, we get a characterization of affine maps between convex sets of states which preserve separable pure states in both directions. Such a map is of the form either $\Phi(\rho) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\Lambda(\rho)(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ or $\Phi(\rho) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\Lambda(\theta(\rho))(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$, where U is a unitary operator, Λ is one of the identity map, the transpose, the partial transpose with respect to any fixed product orthonormal basis of $H\otimes K$, $\theta:\mathcal{T}(H\otimes K)\to\mathcal{T}(K\otimes H)$ is the swap determined by $\theta(A\otimes B)=B\otimes A$.

In Section 4, a brief discussion of the question for multipartite systems is given. Some results similar to that bipartite systems in Section 3 are given.

2. Linear maps preserving pure states

In this section we discuss the question of characterizing linear maps preserving pure states, which is basic for subsequent sections.

The following lemma comes from [2], which can be viewed as a characterization of linear preservers of pure states for finite dimensional systems.

Let $\mathbf{H}_m$ be the real linear space of all $m\times m$ Hermitian matrices and let $\mathcal{P}_m$ be the set of all rank-1 $m\times m$ projection matrices.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose $\phi:\mathbf{H}_m\to\mathbf{H}_n$ is linear and satisfies $\phi(\mathcal{P}_m)\subseteq\mathcal{P}_n$. Then one of the following holds:

(i) *There is* $Q\in\mathcal{P}_n$ *such that* $\phi(A)=(\mathrm{Tr}(A))Q$ *for all* $A\in\mathbf{H}_m$.

(ii) $m\leq n$ *and there is a matrix* $U\in M_{m\times n}$ *with* $U^*U=I_m$ *such that* $\phi(A)=UAU^*$ *for all* $A\in\mathbf{H}_m$, *or* $\phi(A)=UA^tU^*$ *for all* $A\in\mathbf{H}_m$.

The main purpose of this section is to characterize linear preservers of pure states for infinite dimensional systems, which are also needed in characterizing separable pure states preservers in next section. Recall that a linear map $V:H\to K$ is an isometry if $\|Vx\|=\|x\|$ for all $x\in H$, or equivalently, $V^*V=I_H$, the identity operator on H. The conjugate linear isometry is defined similarly.

Theorem 2.2. *Let* H *and* K *be Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that* $\Phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$ *is a real linear map. Then* Φ *satisfies* $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ *if and only if there exists a linear map* $\phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$ *vanishing on each finite-rank operator and one of the following holds:*

(i) *There is some* $R\in\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ *such that* $\Phi(A)=\mathrm{Tr}(A)R+\phi(A)$ *for all* $A\in\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$.

(ii) $\dim H\leq\dim K$ *and there is a linear or conjugate linear isometry* $U:H\to K$ *such that* $\Phi(A)=UAU^*+\phi(A)$ *for all* $A\in\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$.

Proof. Only the “only if” part should be checked.

Suppose that Φ preserves pure states. By Lemma 2.1, we may assume that $\dim H=\infty$. Define a map $\Psi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K)$ given by

$$\Psi(S)=\Psi(\begin{bmatrix}A & C\\ C^* & B\end{bmatrix})=\begin{bmatrix}\Phi(A) & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}$$

for all

$$S=\begin{bmatrix} A & C \\ C^* & B \end{bmatrix}\in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K) \text{ with } A\in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H).$$

It is obvious that Ψ is linear and $\Psi(A\oplus 0)=\Phi(A)\oplus 0$ for all $A\in\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$. Moreover, Ψ is rank one decreasing, that is, $\text{rank}(\Psi(S))\leq 1$ whenever $\text{rank}(S)=1$, since $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(K)$. It follows that $\Psi(\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K))\subseteq\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K)$, here $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ stands for the set of all finite-rank self-adjoint operators on H. Hence, by [5, Theorem 2.10], we get that one of the following is true:

(1) $\Psi(S)=f(S)Q$ for all $S\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K)$, where $f:\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H\oplus K)\to\mathbb{R}$ is a linear map and Q is a rank one projection;

(2) $\Psi(x\otimes x)=\lambda Tx\otimes Tx$ for all $x\in H\oplus K$, where λ is a nonzero real number and $T:H\oplus K\to H\oplus K$ is a linear or conjugate linear operator.

If (1) holds, then there exists some $R\in\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that $Q=R\oplus 0$ and $\Phi(A)=g(A)R$ for all $A\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$, where $g(A)=f(A\oplus 0)$. Since $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(K)$, we have $g(P)=1$ for all $P\in\mathcal{P}ur(H)$. Now, for any $A\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$, write $A=\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_iP_i$, which is the spectral decomposition of A. It follows from the linearity of Φ that $g(A)=g(\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_iP_i)=\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_ig(P_i)=\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i=\text{Tr}(A)$, that is, (i) holds for all finite-rank operators. Next let us show that (i) holds for all $A\in\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$. Note that Φ is bounded on the norm space $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ endowed with the trace-norm. In fact, $\|\Phi|_{\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)}\|\leq\|R\|$. Let $\widehat{\Phi}:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$ be the bounded linear map defined by $\widehat{\Phi}(A)=\text{Tr}(A)R$ and let $\phi=\Phi-\widehat{\Phi}$. Then, $\phi(F)=0$ for each $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ and $\Phi(A)=\text{Tr}(A)R+\phi(A)$ for all A, as desired.

Now assume that (2) holds. Note that $\Psi(A\oplus 0)=\Phi(A)\oplus 0$. Then Φ has the form $\Phi(x\otimes x)=\lambda Ux\otimes Ux$ for all $x\in H$, where U is the part of T restricted to H. Next we prove that U is bounded. In fact, since $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(K)$, we have

$$\lambda\langle Ux,Ux\rangle=\lambda\|Ux\|^2=1 \tag{2.1}$$

for all unit vector $x\in H$, which implies $\lambda>0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda=1$. Since U is linear or conjugate linear, by Eq.(2.1), we get $\|Ux\|=\|x\|$ for all $x\in H$. It follows that U is bounded and $U^*U=I_H$, that is, U is an isometry or conjugate isometry. Then $\Phi(x\otimes x)=U(x\otimes x)U^*$, and consequently, $\Phi(A)=UAU^*$ for all $A\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$. Let $\phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ be the linear map defined by $\phi(A)=\Phi(A)-UAU^*$ for every A. Then $\Phi(A)=UAU^*+\phi(A)$ for all $A\in\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$, that is, (ii) of Theorem 2.2 holds.

The proof of the theorem is complete. □

Remark 2.3. If the linear map $\phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ is not zero, then ϕ is not continuous because $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ is dense in $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$. Such linear maps exist. For example, take any nonzero linear map $\widehat{\phi} : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)/\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$, and let ϕ be defined by $\phi(A) = \widehat{\phi}(\pi(A))$ for any $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$, where $\pi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)/\mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ is the quotient map.

The following corollary is immediate from Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.4. *Let H and K be Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$ is a bounded real linear map. Then Φ satisfies $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) *There is some $R \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that $\Phi(A) = \mathrm{Tr}(A)R$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$.*

(ii) *There is a linear or conjugate linear isometry $U : H \to K$ with $U^*U = I_H$ such that $\Phi(A) = UAU^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$.*

Note that, a bijective affine map preserves pure states in both directions. So the following corollary is a generalization of Kadison's characterization of affine isomorphisms on $\mathcal{S}(H)$, which says that a bijective affine map has the form $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^*$, where U is a unitary or conjugate unitary operator (Ref., for instance, [1, Theorem 8.1]).

Corollary 2.5. *Let H and K be Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(H) \to \mathcal{S}(K)$ is an affine map. Then Φ satisfies $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

(i) *There is some $R \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that $\Phi(\rho) = R$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$.*

(ii) *There is a linear or conjugate linear isometry $U : H \to K$ such that $\Phi(\rho) = U\rho U^*$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$.*

Proof. We need only to show that if $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(H) \to \mathcal{S}(K)$ is affine and preserves pure states, then Φ has the form (i) or the form (ii) stated in the corollary.

To do this, note that the affinity of Φ allow us to extend it to a linear map (Ref. [2] for details), still denoted by Φ, from $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ into $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(K)$. Every $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ has a representation $A = A^+ - A^-$ with $A^\pm \geq 0$ and $A^+A^- = 0$. Thus $\|A\|_{\rm Tr} = \|A^+\|_{\rm Tr} + \|A^-\|_{\rm Tr}$. As $\|\Phi(\rho)\|_{\rm Tr} = \|\rho\|_{\rm Tr}$ for all states ρ, we see that $\|\Phi(A)\|_{\rm Tr} \leq \|\Phi(A^+)\|_{\rm Tr} + \|\Phi(A^-)\|_{\rm Tr} = \|A^+\|_{\rm Tr} + \|A^-\|_{\rm Tr} = \|A\|_{\rm Tr}$. Hence Φ is bounded and, by Corollary 2.4, Φ has the desired form. □

3. LINEAR MAPS PRESERVING SEPARABLE PURE STATES: BIPARTITE SYSTEMS

Now we are ready to give a characterization of linear maps preserving separable pure states for bipartite quantum systems.

Write $\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K) = \{P \otimes Q : P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H),\ Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let H and K be any Hilbert spaces. The set of separable states $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ is a convex set, whose extreme points is $\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$.*

Proof. Obvious. □

Denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$ the real linear space generalized by $\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$, the set of all separable states on $H\otimes K$; $\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$ the subspace of all finite-rank operators in $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$. We denote by ${\rm Tr}_i$ the partial trace of ith subsystem, that is, ${\rm Tr}_1={\rm Tr}_H$ and ${\rm Tr}_2={\rm Tr}_K$. Clearly, ${\rm Tr}_i$ is linear.

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.2. *Let H and K be two Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K)\rightarrow\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K)$ is a linear map. Then $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

(1) *There exists $R_1\otimes R_2\in\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)={\rm Tr}(F)R_1\otimes R_2$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(2) *There exist $R_2\in\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_1:H\rightarrow H$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)=U_1[{\rm Tr}_2(F)]U_1^*\otimes R_2$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(3) *There exist $R_1\in\mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_2:K\rightarrow K$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)=R_1\otimes U_2[{\rm Tr}_1(F)]U_2^*$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(4) $\dim H\geq\dim K$, *there exist $R_2\in\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_1:K\rightarrow H$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)=U_1[{\rm Tr}_1(F)]U_1^*\otimes R_2$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(5) $\dim H\leq\dim K$, *there exist $R_1\in\mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_2:H\rightarrow K$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)=R_1\otimes U_2[{\rm Tr}_2(F)]U_2^*$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(6) *There exist, may not simultaneously, linear or conjugate linear isometries $U_1:H\rightarrow H$ and $U_2:K\rightarrow K$ such that*

$$\Phi(F)=(U_1\otimes U_2)F(U_1\otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(7) $\dim H = \dim K$, *there exist, may not simultaneously, linear or conjugate linear isometries* $U_1 : K \to H$ *and* $U_2 : H \to K$ *such that*

$$\Phi(F) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\theta(F)(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sep}}(H \otimes K)$, *where* $\theta : \mathcal{T}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}(K \otimes H)$ *is the swap determined by* $\theta(A \otimes B) = B \otimes A$.

(8) $\dim K \leq \dim H$, *there exist* $R_2 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ *and a linear map* $\phi_1 : \mathcal{F}_{\text{sep}}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{F}_{\text{sa}}(H)$ *such that, for each* $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_1(P \otimes Q) = U_P Q U_P^* = V_Q P V_Q^*$ *for some, may not synchronously, linear or conjugate linear isometries* $U_P : K \to H$, $V_Q : H \to H$, *and*

$$\Phi(F) = \phi_1(F) \otimes R_2$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sep}}(H \otimes K)$.

(9) $\dim H \leq \dim K$, *there exist* $R_1 \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ *and a linear map* $\phi_2 : \mathcal{F}_{\text{sep}}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{F}_{\text{sa}}(K)$ *such that, for each* $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_2(P \otimes Q) = U_P Q U_P^* = V_Q P V_Q^*$ *for some, may not synchronously, linear or conjugate linear isometries* $U_P : K \to K$, $V_Q : H \to K$, *and*

$$\Phi(F) = R_1 \otimes \phi_2(F)$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sep}}(H \otimes K)$.

Proof. It is clear that if any one of (1)-(9) holds, then Φ preserves separable pure states. So we only need to check the converse.

Assume that $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$.

Define two maps $\phi_1 : (\mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H), \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(K)) \to \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H)$ and $\phi_2 : (\mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H), \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(K)) \to \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(K)$ by

$$\phi_1(A, B) = \text{Tr}_2(\Phi(A \otimes B)) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(A, B) = \text{Tr}_1(\Phi(A \otimes B)). \tag{3.1}$$

Fix a $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. Then $\phi_1(\cdot, Q) : \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q) : \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\text{sa}}(K)$ are both linear. By the assumption, we have

$$\Phi(P \otimes Q) = \text{Tr}_2(\Phi(P \otimes Q)) \otimes \text{Tr}_1(\Phi(P \otimes Q)) = \phi_1(P, Q) \otimes \phi_2(P, Q)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. It follows that

$$\phi_1(\mathcal{P}ur(H), Q) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(H) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(\mathcal{P}ur(H), Q) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(K).$$

Thus, using Theorem 2.2 to $\phi_1(\cdot, Q)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q)$, respectively, we get that, either

(i) there is pure state R_{iQ} such that $\phi_i(A, Q) = \text{Tr}(A) R_{iQ}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sa}}(H)$, $i = 1, 2$, or

(ii) there is a linear or conjugate linear operator U_{iQ} with $U_{iQ}^* U_{iQ} = I_H$ such that $\phi_i(A) = U_{iQ} A U_{iQ}^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{sa}}(H)$, $i = 1, 2$.

Observe that ϕ_is are continuous on $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sa}}(H)$.

Now, we consider the map ϕ_1.

Claim 1. Either ϕ_1 has the form (i) for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ or ϕ_1 has the form (ii) for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$.

Fix $A_0 = e_1 \otimes e_1 - e_2 \otimes e_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$ and define a function $F : \mathcal{P}ur(K) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $F(Q) = \|\phi_1(A_0, Q)\|_{\rm Tr}$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. Note that $F(Q) = \|{\rm Tr}(A_0)R_{1Q}\|_{\rm Tr} = 0$ if ϕ_1 has the form (i) and $F(Q) = \|U_{iQ}A_0U_{iQ}^*\|_{\rm Tr} = \|A_0\|_{\rm Tr} = 2$ if ϕ_1 has the form (ii).

Take any two distinct $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. Then there exists two linearly independent unit vectors $x, y \in K$ such that $Q_1 = x \otimes x$ and $Q_2 = y \otimes y$. For any $t \in [0, 1]$, define

$$Q(t) = \frac{1}{\|x + t(y - x)\|^2}(x + t(y - x)) \otimes (x + t(y - x)) \in \mathcal{P}ur(K).$$

Clearly, $Q(0) = Q_1$ and $Q(1) = Q_2$. Note that, for each $t \in [0, 1]$, $\phi_1(\cdot, Q(t))$ has the form (i) or (ii). Let $\mathcal{L} = {\rm span}\{A_0 \otimes Q(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{L}$ is of finite dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$ and hence $\Phi|_{\mathcal{L}}$ is continuous. It follows that $\phi_1|_{\mathcal{L}}$ is continuous and hence $t \mapsto F(Q(t))$ is a continuous map. As $F(Q(t))$ can take only two possible distinct values, it must be a constant. So Claim 1 holds.

Similarly, we have

Claim 1′. Either ϕ_2 has the form (i) for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ or ϕ_2 has the form (ii) for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$.

Claim 2. One of the following holds:

(a) For all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, both $\phi_1(\cdot, Q)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q)$ have the form (i).

(b) For all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_1(\cdot, Q)$ has the form (i) and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q)$ has the form (ii).

(c) For all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_1(\cdot, Q)$ has the form (ii) and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q)$ has the form (i).

We need only to check that, for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_1(\cdot, Q)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q)$ can not have the form (ii) simultaneously. If there exist some $Q_0 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that both $\phi_1(\cdot, Q_0)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot, Q_0)$ are of the form (ii). So there exist isometric or conjugate isometric operators $U_{1Q_0} : H \to H$ and $U_{2Q_0} : H \to K$ such that $\phi_i(A, Q_0) = U_{iQ_0}AU_{iQ_0}^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(H)$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus, we must have $\dim H \leq \dim K$ and

$$\Phi(P \otimes Q_0) = \phi_1(P, Q_0) \otimes \phi_2(P, Q_0) = U_{1Q_0}PU_{1Q_0}^* \otimes U_{2Q_0}PU_{2Q_0}^* = U(P \otimes P)U^* \tag{3.2}$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, where $U = U_{1Q_0} \otimes U_{2Q_0} : H \otimes H \to H \otimes K$. Particularly, take $P_1 = e_1 \otimes e_1$, $P_2 = e_2 \otimes e_2$, $P_3 = \frac{1}{2}(e_1 \otimes e_1 + e_1 \otimes e_2 + e_2 \otimes e_1 + e_2 \otimes e_2)$ and $P_4 = \frac{1}{2}(e_1 \otimes e_1 - e_1 \otimes e_2 - e_2 \otimes e_1 + e_2 \otimes e_2)$. Then $P_1 + P_2 = P_3 + P_4$ and so $P_1 \otimes Q_0 + P_2 \otimes Q_0 = P_3 \otimes Q_0 + P_4 \otimes Q_0$. However, by a simple calculation, $P_1 \otimes P_1 + P_2 \otimes P_2 \neq P_3 \otimes P_3 + P_4 \otimes P_4$. Note that

$$\Phi(P_1 \otimes Q_0 + P_2 \otimes Q_0) = U(P_1 \otimes P_1 + P_2 \otimes P_2)U^*$$

and

$$\Phi(P_3 \otimes Q_0 + P_4 \otimes Q_0) = U(P_3 \otimes P_3 + P_4 \otimes P_4)U^*.$$

It follows that $\Phi(P_1 \otimes Q_0 + P_2 \otimes Q_0) \neq \Phi(P_3 \otimes Q_0 + P_4 \otimes Q_0)$, a contradiction. So the claim is true.

Similarly, one can check that

Claim 3. One of the following holds:

(a$'$) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, both $\phi_1(P, \cdot)$ and $\phi_2(P, \cdot)$ have the form (i).

(b$'$) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, $\phi_1(P, \cdot)$ has the form (i) and $\phi_2(P, \cdot)$ has the form (ii).

(c$'$) For all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, $\phi_1(P, \cdot)$ has the form (ii) and $\phi_2(P, \cdot)$ has the form (i).

Claim 4. If (a) and (a$'$) hold, then there exists $R_1 \otimes R_2 \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ such that

$$\Phi(F) = \mathrm{Tr}(F)R_1 \otimes R_2$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sep}}(H \otimes K)$. Hence Φ has the form (1).

Suppose that (a) and (a$'$) hold, that is, for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, we have $\phi_i(A, Q) = \mathrm{Tr}(A)R_{iQ}$, and, for all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, we have $\phi_i(P, B) = \mathrm{Tr}(B)R_{iP}$. Fix $P_0 \in \mathcal{P}_H$ and $Q_0 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. Then we get

$$\phi_i(P, Q) = \phi_i(P, Q_0) = \phi_i(P_0, Q_0) = R_i.$$

Therefore, $\Phi(P \otimes Q) = R_1 \otimes R_2$ for all $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. By the linearity of Φ, one sees that the Claim 4 is true.

Claim 5. If (a) and (b$'$) hold, then Φ has the form (3).

In this case, for any $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ we have

$$\Phi(P \otimes Q) = R_{1Q} \otimes R_{2Q} = R_{1P} \otimes U_{2P}QU_{2P}^*,$$

which implies that $R_{1Q} = R_{1P}$ is independent of P, Q and $U_{2P}QU_{2P}^* = R_{2Q}$ is independent of P. So there exist $R_1 \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry U_2 such that $\Phi(P \otimes Q) = R_1 \otimes U_1QU_2^* = R_1 \otimes U_2[\mathrm{Tr}_1(P \otimes Q)]U_2^*$ for all separable pure states $P \otimes Q$. Now by the linearity of Φ the claim is true.

Similarly, one can show the following Claims 6-8.

Claim 6. If (a) and (c$'$) hold, then (2) holds, that is, there exist $R_2 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_1 : K \to H$ such that

$$\Phi(F) = U_1[\mathrm{Tr}_1(F)]U_1^* \otimes R_2$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sep}}(H \otimes K)$. In this case we must have $\dim H \geq \dim K$.

Claim 7. If (b) and (a$'$) hold, then Φ has the form (5), that is, there exist $R_1 \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_2 : H \to K$ such that

$$\Phi(F) = R_1 \otimes U_2[\mathrm{Tr}_2(F)]U_2^*$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$. In this case $\dim H \leq \dim K$.

Claim 8. If (c) and (a$'$) hold, then there exist $R_2 \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and linear or conjugate linear isometry $U_1 : H \to H$ such that

$$\Phi(F) = U_1[\mathrm{Tr}_2(F)]U_1^* \otimes R_2$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$. Hence Φ takes the form (4).

Claim 9. If (b) and (c$'$) hold, then Φ has the form (7).

Now suppose that (b) and (c$'$) hold. Then

$$\phi_2(\cdot, Q_0) = U_{2Q_0}(\cdot)U_{2Q_0}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_1(P_0, \cdot) = U_{1P_0}(\cdot)U_{1P_0}^*$$

with $U_{2Q_0}^*U_{2Q_0} = I_H$ and $U_{1P_0}^*U_{1P_0} = I_K$. Moreover,

$$\phi_1(P_0, Q) = \mathrm{Tr}(P_0)R_{1Q} = \mathrm{Tr}(P)R_{1Q} = \phi_1(P, Q)$$

and

$$\phi_2(P, Q_0) = \mathrm{Tr}(Q_0)R_{2P} = \mathrm{Tr}(Q)R_{2P} = \phi_2(P, Q).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\Phi(P \otimes Q) = \phi_1(P, Q) \otimes \phi_2(P, Q) = \phi_1(P_0, Q) \otimes \phi_2(P, Q_0) = U_{1P_0}QU_{1P_0}^* \otimes U_{2Q_0}PU_{2Q_0}^*$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(K)$. Let $U_1 = U_{1P_0}$ and $U_2 = U_{2Q_0}$. Then $\Phi(P \otimes Q) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)(Q \otimes P)(U_1 \otimes U_2)^* = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\theta(P \otimes Q)(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$ for all separable pure states $P \otimes Q$. Obviously, $\dim H = \dim K$ in this case. It follows from the linearity of Φ that the claim is true.

Similarly, we have

Claim 10. If (c) and (b$'$) hold, then there exists, may not simultaneously, linear or conjugate linear isometries $U_1 : H \to H$ and $U_2 : K \to K$ such that

$$\Phi(F) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)F(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$. Hence in this case we have (6).

Claim 11. If (b) and (b$'$) hold, then Φ has the form (9).

Assume (b) and (b$'$) hold synchronously. Then for any $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ we have $\Phi(P \otimes Q) = R_{1Q} \otimes U_{2Q}PU_{2Q}^* = R_{1P} \otimes U_{2P}QU_{2P}^*$. It follows that there exist $R_1 \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ such that $R_{1Q} = R_{1P} = R_1$ and $U_{2Q}PU_{2Q}^* = U_{2P}QU_{2P}^*$ for all P, Q. Thus there exists a linear map $\phi_2 : \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{F}_{\rm sa}(K)$ such that, for each $P \otimes Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$, $\phi_2(P \otimes Q) = U_P Q U_P^* = V_Q P V_Q^*$ for some, may not synchronously, linear or conjugate linear isometries $U_P : K \to K$, $V_Q : H \to K$, and

$$\Phi(F) = R_1 \otimes \phi_2(F)$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$. In this case $\dim H \leq \dim K$. So the claim is true.

Similarly,

Claim 12. If (c) and (c′) hold, then Φ takes the form (8).

The proof of the theorem is complete. □

The cases (8) and (9) of Theorem 3.2 seem not as natural as other forms, but they may occur, even for finite dimensional cases. For example, let $H = K$. For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}ur(H)$, we have $\mathcal{U}(P) = \mathcal{U}(Q)$, where $\mathcal{U}(P) = \{UPU^* : U \in \mathcal{B}(H) \text{ is unitary}\}$ is the unitary orbit of P. Fix P and a unitary U_P. Then there is a unitary U_Q such that $U_Q P U_Q^* = U_P Q U_P^*$ for any Q. For fixed Q and U_Q, there exists U_P for every P such that $U_Q P U_Q^* = U_P Q U_P^*$ (We may even require that $U_Q P U_Q^* \neq U_{Q_1} P U_{Q_1}^*$ and $U_P Q U_P^* \neq U_{P_1} Q U_{P_1}^*$ whenever $P \neq P_1$ and $Q \neq Q_1$). For above U_P, U_Q, let $\phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H)$ be a bounded linear map determined by $\phi(P \otimes Q) = U_P Q U_P^* = U_Q P U_Q^*$. As $\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(H)$ is a linearly independent set, ϕ is well-defined. Take any pure state R and let $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes H) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes H)$ be a map defined by $\Phi(A) = R \otimes \phi(A)$. Then, Φ is a linear map of the form (9) and preserves pure states.

Corollary 3.3. *Let H and K be two Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes K)$ is a linear map satisfying $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K))$ contains two elements $P_i' \otimes Q_i'$, $i = 1, 2$, with $\{P_1', P_2'\}$ and $\{Q_1', Q_2'\}$ are linearly independent sets. Then Φ has the form (6) or (7) in Theorem 3.2.*

In the case of finite dimension, we get a generalization of the main result obtained in [2], there the condition $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)) = \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ is assumed.

Corollary 3.4. *Let H and K be two finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H \otimes K)$ is a linear map. Then $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(H) \otimes \mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if one of the statements (1)-(9) holds for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$.*

Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim H}$ and $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^{\dim K}$ be orthonormal bases of H and K respectively. With respect to the product basis $\{e_i \otimes u_j\}_{i,j}$ of $H \otimes K$, the linear map $\mathbf{T} \otimes {\rm id} : \mathcal{T}(H \otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}(H \otimes K)$ determined by $A \otimes B \mapsto A^T \otimes B$ is called the partial transpose of the first system. The partial transpose of the second system ${\rm id} \otimes \mathbf{T}$ is defined similarly. In terms of partial transposition, one can restate Theorem 3.2 to avoid the term "conjugate linear". In fact, if U is a conjugate isometry, then there exists an isometry V such that $UAU^* = VA^tV^*$ for all A.

The next result is a characterization of linear maps preserving separable pure states in both directions. We state it avoiding the term "conjugate linear".

Corollary 3.5. *Let H and K be two Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K)$ is a linear map. Then $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)) = \mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ if and only if one of the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *There exist unitary operators $U_1 \in \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $U_2 \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ such that*

$$\Phi(F) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\Lambda(F)(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$.

(ii) $\dim H = \dim K$, *there exist unitary operators $U_1 \in \mathcal{B}(K,H)$ and $U_2 \in \mathcal{B}(H,K)$ such that*

$$\Phi(F) = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\Lambda(\theta(F))(U_1 \otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H \otimes K)$.

Where Λ is one of the identity map, the transpose, the partial transpose with respect to any fixed product orthonormal basis of $H\otimes K$, $\theta : \mathcal{T}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}(K\otimes H)$ is the swap determined by $\theta(A\otimes B) = B\otimes A$.

Proof. By Corollary 3.3, we see that $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)) = \mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$ implies (6) or (7) holds. Moreover, the linear or conjugate linear isometries involved are all surjective and hence unitary or conjugate unitary. □

Remark 3.6. Note that, by the proof of Theorem 3.2, the assumption of $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K)$ may be replaced by the assumption of $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$, and the results of Theorem 3.2, Corollaries 3.3-3.5 remain true. This remark is useful in some applications.

In the following let us consider the maps preserve states and separable pure states.

Theorem 3.7. *Let H and K be two Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H\otimes K)$ is a linear map satisfying $\Phi(\mathcal{S}(H\otimes K)) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(H\otimes K)$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)) \subseteq \mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$.

(2) *The conditions (1)-(9) in Theorem 3.2 holds for all $A \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.*

Proof. (2)⇒(1) is obvious. As to (1)⇒(2), The assumption $\Phi(\mathcal{S}(H\otimes K)) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(H\otimes K)$ implies that Φ is continuous, and then, apply Theorem 3.2. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let H and K be two Hilbert spaces of any dimension. Suppose that $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(H\otimes K) \to \mathcal{S}(H\otimes K)$ is an affine map. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $\Phi(\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)) = \mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

(2) $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K))=\mathcal{P}ur(H)\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(K)$.

(3) *Either*

(i) *There exist unitary operators* $U_1\in\mathcal{B}(H)$ *and* $U_2\in\mathcal{B}(K)$ *such that*

$$\Phi(\rho)=(U_1\otimes U_2)\Lambda(\rho)(U_1\otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $\rho\in\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$*; or*

(ii) $\dim H=\dim K$, *there exist unitary operators* $U_1\in\mathcal{B}(K,H)$ *and* $U_2\in\mathcal{B}(H,K)$ *such that*

$$\Phi(\rho)=(U_1\otimes U_2)\Lambda(\theta(\rho))(U_1\otimes U_2)^*$$

for all $\rho\in\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H\otimes K)$.

Where Λ *is one of the identity map, the transpose, the partial transpose with respect to any fixed product orthonormal basis of* $H\otimes K$, $\theta:\mathcal{T}(H\otimes K)\to\mathcal{T}(K\otimes H)$ *is the swap determined by* $\theta(A\otimes B)=B\otimes A$.

Proof. Obviously, (3)⇒(1)⇒(2). Assume that (2) holds, By Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.5, we see that (i) or (ii) holds for Φ and all separable states ρ, that is, (3) is true. □

4. LINEAR MAPS PRESERVING SEPARABLE PURE STATES: MULTIPARTITE SYSTEMS

The results similar to that in Section 3 for bipartite case are valid for multipartite cases, of course, with a more complicated expression. The proofs are also similar. In this section we only list some of them, which have relatively simple expression and may have more applications. The mean of the notations used here are also similar to that in Section 2.

The following result corresponds to Corollary 3.3.

Theorem 4.1. *Let* $H_1,H_2,\dots,H_n$ *be complex Hilbert spaces of any dimensions and let* $\Phi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$ *be a linear map. Then* $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n))\subseteq\mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n)$ *and there are* $P_1'\otimes\cdots\otimes P_n'\in\mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n)$ *and* $Q_1'\otimes\cdots\otimes Q_n'\in\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n))$ *with* $\{P_i',Q_i'\}$ *is linearly independent for each* $i=1,2,\dots,n$, *if and only if there is a permutation* $\pi:(1,\dots,n)\mapsto(p_1,\dots,p_n)$ *of* $(1,\dots,n)$ *and linear or conjugate linear isometries, may not simultaneously,* $U_j:H_{p_j}\to H_j$, $j=1,\dots,n$, *such that*

$$\Phi(F)=(U_1\otimes\cdots\otimes U_n)\theta_\pi(F)(U_1^*\otimes\cdots\otimes U_n^*) \tag{4.1}$$

holds for all $F\in\mathcal{F}_{\rm sep}(H_1\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$. *Here* $\theta_\pi:\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)\to\mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_{p_1}\otimes H_{p_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes H_{p_n})$ *is a linear map determined by* $\theta_\pi(A_1\otimes A_2\otimes\cdots\otimes A_n))=A_{p_1}\otimes A_{p_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes A_{p_n}$.

It is clear that, if Φ has the form Eq.(4.1), then $\dim H_{p_j}\le\dim H_j$. So, if $\dim H_{p_j}>\dim H_j$ for some j, then Φ can not take the form (4.1) for the permutation $\pi:(1,\dots,n)\mapsto(p_1,\dots,p_n)$.

The following is a special case corresponding to Theorem 3.6.

Theorem 4.2. *A linear map* $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n) \to \mathcal{T}_{\rm sa}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$ *satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.1 and the condition* $\Phi(\mathcal{S}(H_1\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(H_1\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$ *if and only if Eq.(4.1) holds for all* $\rho \in \mathcal{T}_{\rm sep}(H_1\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$.

Particularly,

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_n$ *be complex Hilbert spaces of any dimensions and let* $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n) \to \mathcal{S}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$ *be an affine map. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $\Phi(\mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)) = \mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H_1\otimes H_2\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$.

(2) $\Phi(\mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n)) = \mathcal{P}ur(H_1)\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{P}ur(H_n)$.

(3) *There is a permutation* $\pi : (1,\ldots,n) \mapsto (p_1,\ldots,p_n)$ *of* $(1,\ldots,n)$ *and unitary or conjugate unitary operators, may not simultaneously,* $U_j : H_{p_j} \to H_j$, $j = 1,\ldots,n$, *such that*

$$\Phi(\rho) = (U_1\otimes\cdots\otimes U_n)\theta_\pi(\rho)(U_1^*\otimes\cdots\otimes U_n^*) \tag{4.2}$$

holds for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{\rm sep}(H_1\otimes\cdots\otimes H_n)$.

Obviously, if Φ is of the form (4.2), then $\dim H_{p_j} = \dim H_j$.

Theorems 4.1-4.3 may be restated in term of linear isometric (unitary) operators and partial transpositions like that in Theorem 3.7, but have more complicated expressions.

5. Conclusion

In the most general situation, we consider the question of characterizing linear maps which send pure states to pure states, and the question of characterizing linear maps which send separable pure states to separable pure states. These questions are basic for both quantum information theory and preserver problems. For finite dimensional systems, these questions were studied and solved for a special case that the maps preserve separable pure states in both directions in [2]. In this paper we solve these questions in most general situations and for systems of any dimensions including infinite-dimension. The infinite dimensional cases are more complicated. However, it turns out, for most cases, such maps have nice structures and are essentially tractable. In particular, we get complete characterization of linear maps that preserve both (separable) pure states and states. We believe that the results obtained in this paper are fundamental and helpful for us to understand the algebraic and geometric structures of the set of states and the set of separable states. They would also have applications in study of other questions such as characterizing linear maps leaving some properties of states invariant.

References

[1] I. Bengtsson, K. Zyczkowski, Geometry of Quantum States, An introduction to quantum entangument, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[2] Friedland S, Li C-K, Poon Y-T and Sze N-S 2011 The automorphisms group of separable states in quantum information theory J.Math.Phys. 52 042203.

[3] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions, Phys. Lett. A 223 (1996) 1.

[4] Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., Horodecki, M., and Horodecki, K., Quantum entanglement, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 865 (2009).

[5] M.H. Lim, Additive mappings between Hermitian matrix spaces preserving rank not exceeding one, Lin. Alg. Appl., 408 (2005), 259-267.

[6] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[7] R. F. Werner, Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model, Phys. Rev. A 40 (1989) 4277.

(Jinchuan Hou) Department of Mathematics, Taiyuan University of Technology, Taiyuan 030024, P. R. of China

E-mail address: `jinchuanhou@yahoo.com.cn`

(Xiaofei Qi) Department of Mathematics, Shanxi University , Taiyuan 030006, P. R. of China;

E-mail address: `xiaofeiqisxu@yahoo.com.cn`